# Exhibit 24 Part F

United States of America ex rel. Ven-a-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. v. Abbott Laboratories,
Inc., et al.,
Civil Action No. 01-12257-PBS

Exhibit to the July 24, 2009, Declaration of George B. Henderson, II
In Support of United States' Common Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motions for Partial Summary Judgment and in Opposition to the Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment

#### Attachment 3

Supporting Documentation Relied Upon by Myers and Stauffer

For the State of North Carolina

## **DOJ Pharmacy Reimbursement Project**

# **North Carolina**

**July 2009** 

£1911111000

State of: NORTH CAROLINA

**Medicaid Pharmacy Reimbursement Methodology Summary** 

		"Lowe	r of" Reir	nbursemei	nt Methodolog	у							
		Usual and			Lowest Charge to Other 3rd		Estimated Acquis	sition Cost (EAC) 3	SMAC	Physician Override (DAW, Brand	Dispens	ing Fee 1	Compound
Effective	Time Period	Customary	FUL.	EAC 4	Party	SMAC	Brand	Generic	Methodology	Medically	Brand	Generic	Drugs
10/1/1989	- 12/31/1991	Y	Υ	Y	Υ 7	N	AWP - 10% <sup>6</sup>	AWP - 10% <sup>6</sup>		Υ	\$4.85	\$4.85	
1/1/1992	- 6/30/1992	Y	Υ	Υ	Υ 7	N	AWP - 10%	AWP - 10%		Υ	\$5.60	\$5.60	
7/1/1992	- 11/30/2001	Y	Υ	Y		N	AWP - 10%	AWP - 10%	***************************************	Υ	\$5.60	\$5.60	
12/1/2001	- Present	Υ	Y	Y		Y	AWP - 10%	AWP - 10%	2	Υ	\$4.00	\$5.60	5

Data taken from North Carolina Medicaid State Plan Amendments

Data provided by Weeks 10/21/08 deposition and exhibits

Data provided by Lisa Weeks, Pharmacy Policy Supervisor

Legend/Prescription Drugs

<sup>1</sup> Per TN #89-09 et al. (Ex. 11, 12), the dispensing fee is paid to all providers for the initial dispensing. Refills within the same month are not paid a dispensing fee.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> SMAC methodology - reimbursement is based on 150 percent of the lowest priced generic. In cases where 150 percent results in a price less than the cost of the second-lowest generic product, at least an additional 10 percent margin is added to the cost of the second-lowest drug to establish the MAC price. (Deposition pp. 45-46, 49) For established generic drugs with only one supplier, the MAC price is established between the actual acquisition cost and the average wholesale price of the generic drug. A minimum reimbursement of 20 percent above actual acquisition is guaranteed for these drugs. In most cases, MAC pricing is substantially higher than the 20 percent. (Deposition pp. 95, 263-265, Ex. 13)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Per TN #92-05 et al., the state uses First DataBank for pricing (Ex. 12). (See also deposition pp. 43-44, 91-92)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Per TN #89-09 et al., EAC is referred to as NCEAC or North Carolina Estimated Acquisition Cost. (See also deposition pp. 86-87)

10/1/1989 - 12/31/1991

# Pupini post

Attachment 4.19-B Section 12, Page 1a

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE State NORTH CAROLINA

PAYMENTS FOR MEDICAL AND REMEDIAL CARE AND SERVICE

#### 1. Other Prugs -

Reimbursement for covered drugs other than the multiple-source Tower of drugs with HCFA upper limits shall not exceed the lower of:

- (i) The North Carolina estimated acquisition cost (NCEAC) for the drug plus a reasonable dispensing fee; or
- (ii) The provider's lowest charge to other third party payors;
- (iii) The provider's usual and customary charge to the general public for the drug.
- 2. North Carolina Estimated Acquisition Cost (NCEAC) \* FN \*++

NCEAC is defined as the reasonable and best estimate of the price paid by providers for a drug as obtained from a manufacturer or the other legal distributor. As determined by the Division the reasonable and best estimate is based on the average wholesale price (AWP) less 10 percent. For the AWP information the Division uses the Red Book, manufacturer's price list, or other nationally published sources. Telephone contact with manufacturer or distributors may be utilized when a published source is not available.

#### 3. Dispensing Ease

Dispensing fees are determined on the basis of surveys that are conducted periodically by Division of Medical Assistance (DMA) or other recognized sources and takes into account various phermacy operational costs, such as salary, overhead, etc. Between surveys the dispensing fee may be adjusted based upon various factors, i.e., Consumer Price Index (CPI). The Division reviews the fees of other states and other information (i.e., National Pharmacy Surveys). The dispensing fee is paid to all providers for the initial dispensing. Refills within the same month are not paid a dispensing fee. The dispensing fee is \$4.55.

TN No. 89-09 -Supersedes TN No. NEW

Approval Date SEP 18 580

Eff. Date 10/1/87

Weeks Ex II

Attachment 4.19-B Section 12, Page 1

\*

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE State NORTH CAROLINA

PAVMENTS	FOR	MEDICAL	$\Delta MD$	REMEDIAL	CARE	AND.	SEBUICE

- 12. Prescribed drugs, dentures, and prosthetic devices; and eyeglasses prescribed by a physician skilled in diseases of the eye or by an optometrist.
  - a. Prescribed drugs.

Drugs will be reimbursed at the lowest of: the estimated acquisition cost as described below plus a reasonable dispensing fee; the provider's lowest charge to other third party payors; |owest or, the provider's charge to the general public. A dispensing charge fee will not be paid for prescriptions refilled in the same month, whether it is the same drug or generic equivalent drug.

Multiple Source Drugs - North Carolina has implemented the list FUL of drugs and their prices as published by the Health Care Financing Administration. All drugs on this list are reimbursed at limits set by HCFA unless the physician writes in his own handwriting on the face of the prescription "brand necessary, BMN dispense as written," or words of similar meaning.

Replaced 25

TN No. 89-09 Supersedes TN No. 91-10 SEP 18 1990

Approval Date \_\_\_\_

Eff. Date 10/1/90

October 21, 2008

## Raleigh, NC

23 (Pages 86 to 89)

			23 (Pages 86 to 89
	86		88
1	limit prior, earlier today?	1	when a public source was not available?
2	A. Yes.	2	A. I believe on occasion but very rarely.
3	Q. The paragraph that you just read refers	3	Q. And by very rarely, how often per year
4	to the estimated acquisition cost as described	4	do you mean?
5	below.	5	A. Would only be for manual claims that we
6	Do you see that there?	6	didn't have the AWP available. And I don't have
7	A. Yes.	7	an exact number, but it's very rare.
8	Q. Does the state plan define the	8	Q. Very rare that you contacted them, or
9	estimated acquisition cost below, as that	9	very rare that you did not have the AWP
10	paragraph says that it does?	10	available?
	A. No, not in that next section.	11	A. Both.
12	Q. Does it describe the estimated	12	Q. And if you look at the prior paragraph,
13	acquisition cost as part of the plan?	13	No. 1, other drugs, would you take a minute to
14	A. It does as part of the plan.	14	look that over, please?
15	Q. And where does it describe it? What	15	A. Yes.
16	paragraph?	16	(Pause.)
17	A. In another paragraph under North	17	A. Okay.
18	Carolina estimated acquisition cost.	18	Q. Does this reflect the reimbursement
19	Q. And could you read that out loud,	19	logic that you set forth at the earlier part of
20	please?	20	the deposition as far as the formula?
21	A. Yes. NCEAC	21	A. It's similar.
22	Q. What does that stand for, I'm sorry?	22	Q. And why don't you explain that to me?
	87		89
1.	A. North Carolina Estimated Acquisition	1	A. Over time it's changed somewhat, but
2	Cost,	2	it's similar in that North Carolina uses the
3	Q. Thank you.	3	lesser of logic. We will pay the estimated
4	A. Is defined as the reasonable and best	4	acquisition cost or the providers or the
5	estimate of the price paid by providers for a	5	provider's usual and customary. We no longer
6	drug, as obtained from a manufacturer or other	6	have the lowest charge to other third-party
7	legal distributor. As determined by the	7	payors in our state plan.
8	division, the reasonable and best estimate is	8	Q. And again, what is the date of the
9	based on the average wholesale price, (AWP) less	9	state plan that we are reviewing right now?
1.0	ten percent. For the AWP information, the	10	A. 10-1-89.
11	division uses the Red Book manufacturer's price	11	MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this
12	list or other nationally published sources.	12	next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 12.
13	Telephone contact with manufacturer or	13	(The document referred to was
14	distributors may be utilized when a published	14	marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 012 for
15	source is not available.	15	identification.)
16	Q. Thank you. Is that the estimated	16	Q. Ms. Weeks, do you recognize this
17	acquisition cost as described below that was	17	document?
18		18	A. Yes.
19		19	Q. And what is it?
20		20	A. It's another North Carolina State plan.
21	-	21	Q. And what is this one dated?
22	Carolina contact manufacturers or distributors	22	A. July 1, 1992.

Henderson Legal Services, Inc.

202-220-4158

www.hendersonlegalservices.com

\*\*\*

October 21, 2008

## Raleigh, NC

11 (Pages 38 to 41)

	38		4.0
1	A. It's approved by the Medicaid director,	1	A. Yes.
2	it's approved by the secretary of health and	2	Q. Is that the federal upper limit that
3	human services before it goes to CMS.	3	you're referring to?
4	Q. Where is it submitted?	4	A. Yes.
5	A. Where?	5	Q. And when you said, I'm sorry, if you
6	Q. Where is it formally submitted?	6	could clarify this. The federal upper limit
7	A. From the secretary's office.	7	applies to all drugs or only certain types of
8	Q. And to whom is it submitted?	8	drugs?
9	A. CMS.	9	A. Only certain generics.
10	Q. And what is CMS?	10	Q. And remind me again, I think earlier
11	A. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid	11	you stated that the state's formula involved, you
12	Services.	12	said average wholesale price minus ten percent,
13	Q. Is that a state organization?	13	the federal upper limit, the state maximum
14	A. That's a federal organization.	14	allowable costs?
15	Q. And what is the relationship between	15	A. Yes.
16	that federal organization and the North Carolina	16	Q. And usual and customary?
17	Medicaid program?	17	
18	· ·	1	A. Right.
19	A. The North Carolina Medicaid program	18	Q. I'd like to go through each of those,
20	obtains the federal funding from there, for the Medicaid program.	19	to get a better understanding of what all those
21	• •	20	terms are, okay?
21 22	Q. The federal share?	21	A. Okay.
	A. The federal share, right.	22	Q. So the federal upper limit, I think
	39		43
1	Q. Does the state maintain copies of the	1	you've testified that it's a federal determined
2	plans that it submits?	2	amount, determined limit on payment?
3	A. Yes.	3	A. Yes.
4	Q. I believe earlier you referred to the	4	Q. And the state does not set that amount,
5	federal upper limit. Do you remember that?	5	is that correct?
6	A. Yes.	6	A. That's correct.
7	Q. What do you mean by federal upper	7	Q. Next, let's talk about estimated
8	limit? What does that stand for?	8	acquisition costs, which is referred to in that
9	A. The federal upper limit is a maximum	9	regulation a little bit earlier.
10	= -	10	Does North Carolina itself define
		11	estimated acquisition cost?
11	O. And where is the rederal linner limit?		warrane acquicition colli
11 12		12	A North Carolina has defined it for North
12	Where is that term defined or referenced from?	12 13	A. North Carolina has defined it for North
12 13	Where is that term defined or referenced from?  A. I don't understand the question.	13	Carolina.
12 13 14	Where is that term defined or referenced from?  A. I don't understand the question.  Q. Is it a state term? Is the federal	13 14	Carolina.  Q. And where has North Carolina written
12 13 14 15	Where is that term defined or referenced from?  A. I don't understand the question.  Q. Is it a state term? Is the federal upper limit something that the state has anything	13 14 15	Carolina.  Q. And where has North Carolina written the definition for estimated acquisition cost?
12 13 14 15	Where is that term defined or referenced from?  A. I don't understand the question.  Q. Is it a state term? Is the federal upper limit something that the state has anything to do with?	13 14 15 16	Carolina.  Q. And where has North Carolina written the definition for estimated acquisition cost?  A. In the state plan.
12 13 14 15 16	Where is that term defined or referenced from?  A. I don't understand the question.  Q. Is it a state term? Is the federal upper limit something that the state has anything to do with?  A. No, it's the federal upper limit.	13 14 15 16 17	Carolina.  Q. And where has North Carolina written the definition for estimated acquisition cost?  A. In the state plan.  Q. And what does EAC, is that a common
12 13 14 15 16 17	Where is that term defined or referenced from?  A. I don't understand the question.  Q. Is it a state term? Is the federal upper limit something that the state has anything to do with?  A. No, it's the federal upper limit.  Q. Let me refer you to Exhibit 2, which is	13 14 15 16 17	Carolina.  Q. And where has North Carolina written the definition for estimated acquisition cost?  A. In the state plan.  Q. And what does EAC, is that a common abbreviation for estimated acquisition cost? If
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Where is that term defined or referenced from?  A. I don't understand the question.  Q. Is it a state term? Is the federal upper limit something that the state has anything to do with?  A. No, it's the federal upper limit.  Q. Let me refer you to Exhibit 2, which is this regulation here, Section 447.301 and .331	13 14 15 16 17 18	Carolina.  Q. And where has North Carolina written the definition for estimated acquisition cost?  A. In the state plan.  Q. And what does EAC, is that a common abbreviation for estimated acquisition cost? If I call it EAC, is that something that you will
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Where is that term defined or referenced from?  A. I don't understand the question.  Q. Is it a state term? Is the federal upper limit something that the state has anything to do with?  A. No, it's the federal upper limit.  Q. Let me refer you to Exhibit 2, which is this regulation here, Section 447.301 and .331 and .332. If you flip to the backside, Section	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Carolina.  Q. And where has North Carolina written the definition for estimated acquisition cost?  A. In the state plan.  Q. And what does EAC, is that a common abbreviation for estimated acquisition cost? If I call it EAC, is that something that you will understand?
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Where is that term defined or referenced from?  A. I don't understand the question.  Q. Is it a state term? Is the federal upper limit something that the state has anything to do with?  A. No, it's the federal upper limit.  Q. Let me refer you to Exhibit 2, which is this regulation here, Section 447.301 and .331 and .332. If you flip to the backside, Section 447.332, do you see that there, upper limits for	13 14 15 16 17 18	Carolina.  Q. And where has North Carolina written the definition for estimated acquisition cost?  A. In the state plan.  Q. And what does EAC, is that a common abbreviation for estimated acquisition cost? If I call it EAC, is that something that you will

Henderson Legal Services, Inc.
www.hendersonlegalservices.com

## Raleigh, NC

October 21, 2008

12	(Pa	(
----	-----	---

-		<del></del>	ges 42 to 45
	42		
1	Carolina define EAC or estimated acquisition	1	information.
2	costs?	2	Q. Does North C
3	A. The state defines that as AWP minus ten	3	source available for arolina have any other
4	percent.	4	A. No. verage wholesale prices?
5	Q. And in what year did the state define	5	MR. KATZ: C
6	estimated acquisition cost of AWP minus ten	6	Q. Why did Nort bjection, form.
7	percent?	7	wholesale price minuh Carolina choose average
8	MR. KATZ: Objection, form.	8	estimated acquisitions ten percent as its
9	A. Early '90s, I think 1990.	9	MR, KATZ: C cost?
10	Q. And prior to that time, what was the	10	A. It was the stablection, form.
11	definition of estimated acquisition cost?	11	cost of drugs. te's best estimate of the
12	A. AWP, I believe.	1.2	Q. Why wouldn't
13	Q. And was that the first time that North	13	acquisition cost on events state use actual
14	Carolina has defined estimated acquisition cost?	14	submitted? ry claim that was
15	A. I'm sorry, I don't understand what you	15	A. Because we do
16	just asked.	16	Q. What if the phan't have that available.
17	Q. The AWP minus ten percent was I think	17	every claim that they smacles provided it on
18	you said roughly in 1990?	18	A. We're not oubmitted to the state?
19	MR. KATZ: Objection to form.	19	accommodate that. ir processes would not
20	A. Yes.	20	Q. Why not?
21	Q. And prior to that time, North Carolina	21	A. Because of the
22	had defined estimated acquisition cost as AWP?	22	process. volume of claims we
	43		
			45
1	A. Um-hum.	1	Q. You talked about a
2	MR. KATZ: Objection to form.	2	the formula, the state maxinother component of
3	Q. Do you mean AWP with no discount?	3	A. Yes. imum allowable cost?
4	A. Yes.	4	Q. Could you describ
5	Q. And what does AWP stand for?	5	A. It's a state specific what that means?
б	A. Average wholesale price.	6	drugs that have more th <mark>e limit on generic</mark>
7	Q. And prior to 1990, when the state first	7	Q. And how does a stan two generics available.
8	proposed AWP with no discount, was that	8	cost affect the reimbursen ate maximum allowable
9	definition with estimated acquisition cost used?	9	MR. KATZ: Objection formula?
10	MR. KATZ: Objection to form.	10	A. It's one of the refution to form.
11	A. No, I believe that, if I remember, CMS	11	we use when we process trence prices that
12	would not approve the state plan without a	12	Q. And if you could ca claim.
13	discount.	13	You mentioned the varioularify the formula.
14	Q. A discount to what?	14	formula. How do they s components of the
15	A. To AWP.	15	processing know which barw does the claims
16	Q. Where does North Carolina get its AWPs?	16	A. The claims processis to pay a claim?
17	A. From First Data Bank.	17	the lower or the lowest osing systems selects
18	Q. And why would North Carolina use First	18	mentioned pricing methor the previously
19	Data Bank to get average wholesale price	19	percent, the federal uppedology, AWP minus ten
20	information?	20	maximum allowable coser limit, the state
21	A. Because they provided a file that we	21	customary. list or usual and
22	can use in our claims processing that has that	22	Q. Does the state max
69.53992.0			inum sllowable costs

Henderson Legal Services, Inc. www.henderson

October 21, 2008

#### Raleigh, NC

#### 22 (Pages 82 to 85)

A. I don't think it was possible to implement.  A. Because I don't think the state had access to the lowest third-party plan costs.  Q. So it is but it is part of the proposed reimbursement policy, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And the state's reimbursement methodology was consistent with the state plan, or inconsistent?  A. I was consistent.  Q. Did it exercise this option of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan?  A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it. Q. And why not?  A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third- party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11. (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there? A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.  A. Yes. Q. Had you made the markings at any time prior to today's deposition? A. No. Q. If you'll look at the first page, which is dated 10-1-1990, do you see that there on the bottom right-hand corner? A. Yes. Q. And if you look at Section 12A prescribed drugs, will you read that out loud, please? A. Yes.  P. A. Yes.  I lowest of the estimated acquisition cost, as described below, plus a reasonable dispensing fee, the provider's lowest charge to other third- party payors or the provider's charge to the paid for prescriptions refilled in the same way, whether it is the same drug or generic equivalent drug. Q. And the next paragraph refers to multiple source drugs. Do you see that there? A. Yes. Q. And it says: North Carolina has implemented a list of drugs and the prices, as published by the Health Care Finance Administration. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. Is that the same list published by the Health Care Finance Administration that we referred to in the prior state plan? A.	[ <del></del>			22 (1090) 02 00 05
Q. And if you look at the second sentence:  We have implemented a policy of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan.  Do you see that there?  A. Yes. Q. Did the state implement that provision? A. Not that I'm aware of. Q. And why not? A. I don't think it was possible to implement. Q. Why nor? A. Because I don't think the state had access to the lowest third-party plan costs. Q. Q. And the state's reimbursement policy, correct? A. Yes. Q. And the state's reimbursement policy, correct? A. Yes. Q. And the state's reimbursement policy correct? A. Yes. Q. And the state's reimbursement policy correct? A. Yes. A. It was consistent. Q. Did it exercise this option of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan? A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11. Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there? A. Yes. Q. And the next paragraph refers to multiple source drugs. Do you see that there? A. Yes. Q. And the next paragraph refers to multiple source drugs. Do you see that there? A. Yes. Q. And the next paragraph refers to multiple source drugs. Do you see that there? A. Yes. Q. And the next paragraph refers to multiple source drugs. Do you see that there? A. Yes. Q. And the next paragraph refers to multiple source drugs. Do you see that there? A. Yes. Q. And the next paragraph refers to multiple source drugs. Do you see that there? A. Yes. Q. And the same way, whether it is the same drug or generic equivalent drug. Q. And the next paragraph refers to multiple source drugs. Do you see that there? A. Yes. Q. And the next paragraph refers to multiple source drugs. Do you see that there? A. Yes. Q. And the same list of drugs and the prices, as published by the Health Care Finance Administration that we referred to in the prior sta		82		84
Q. And if you look at the second sentence:  We have implemented a policy of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan.  Do you see that there?  A. Yes. Q. Did the state implement that provision? A. Not that I'm aware of. Q. And why not? A. I don't think the state had access to the lowest third-party plan costs. Q. So it is but it is part of the proposed reimbursement policy, correct? A. Yes. Q. And there's some handwriting on this and also some markings on it. Did you make those markings? A. No. Q. Were they they were on the document as handed to you, correct? A. Yes. Q. Had you made the markings at any time provise to today's deposition? A. No. Q. If you'll look at the first page, which is idated 10-1-1990, do you see that there on the bottom right-hand corner? A. Yes. Q. And the state's reimbursement policy, correct? A. Yes. Q. And the state's reimbursement policy, correct? A. Yes. Q. And the state's reimbursement policy, correct? A. Yes. Q. And the state's reimbursement policy, correct? A. Yes. Q. And the state's reimbursement policy, correct? A. Yes. D. Did it exercise this option of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan? A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11. The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there? A. Yes. D. And there's some handwriting on this and allowing marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there? A. Yes. D. Made to retire, and the provider's bowset charge to eller third-party plans.  I do west of the estimated acquisition cost, as described below, plus a reasonable likpensing feet, the provider's bowset charge to ell ling the same drug or generic equivalent drug.  Q. And the next paragraph refers to mult	1	A. Yes.	1	A. Yes.
3	2	Q. And if you look at the second sentence:	2	
sections regarding drug reimbursement.  Q. And there's some handwriting on this and so some markings on it. Did you make those markings?  A. Yes.  Q. Did the state implement that provision?  A. Not that I'm aware of.  Q. And why not?  A. I don't think it was possible to implement.  Q. Why nor?  A. Because I don't think the state had access to the lowest third-party plan costs.  Q. And the state's reimbursement policy, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And the state's reimbursement methodology was consistent with the state plan, or inconsistent?  A. It was consistent.  Q. Did it exercise this option of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan?  A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it.  Q. And why not?  A. I believe that it was stated that that access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit I1.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Vecks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It's two pages document.	3	·	3	•
than they are receiving from the lowest third- party plan.  Do you see that there?  A. Yes.  Q. Did the state implement that provision? A. Not that I'm aware of.  A. Not that I'm aware of.  Q. And why not?  A. I don't think it was possible to implement.  Q. Why not?  A. Because I don't think the state had access to the lowest third-party plan costs.  A. Yes.  Q. And the state's reimbursement policy, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And the state's reimbursement policy, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And the state's reimbursement policy correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And the state's reimbursement policy correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And the state's reimbursement policy correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And if you look at Section 12A prescribed drugs, will you read that out loud, please?  A. Yes. Drugs will be reimbursed at the prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan?  A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it.  Q. And why not?  A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this ext document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you Exhibit 11, MS. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.	4	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4	
and also some markings on it. Did you make those markings?  A. Yes.  Q. Did the state implement that provision? A. Not that I'm aware of. Q. And why not? A. I don't think it was possible to implement. Q. Why not? A. Because I don't think the state had access to the lowest third-party plan costs. Q. So it is - but it is part of the proposed reimbursement policy, correct? A. Yes. Q. And the state's reimbursement methodology was consistent with the state plan, or inconsistent? A. It was consistent. Q. Did it exercise this option of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan? A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it. Q. And why not? A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11. (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Results of the cost associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11. (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Results implement and also some markings?  A. No.  Q. Were they — they were on the document as handed to you, correct?  A. Yes. Q. If sa two-page document.	5		5	
The proposed reimbursement policy, correct?   A. Yes.   Yes.   Yes.	6		6	
8 A. Yes. 9 Q. Did the state implement that provision? 10 A. Not that I'm aware of. 11 Q. And why not? 12 A. I don't think it was possible to 13 implement. 14 Q. Why not? 15 A. Because I don't think the state had 16 access to the lowest third-party plan costs. 16 Q. So it is but it is part of the 17 proposed reimbursement policy, correct? 18 A. Yes. 19 A. Yes. 19 A. Yes. 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. And the state's reimbursement 21 methodology was consistent with the state plan, or inconsistent? 21 A. It was consistent. 22 Q. Did it exercise this option of not 23 allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan? 24 A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it. 24 Q. And why not? 25 A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans. 26 A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans. 27 A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans. 28 I would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it. 39 Q. And why not? 40 A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans. 41 A. It was consistent. 42 Q. And why not? 43 I lowest of the estimated acquisition cost, as described below, plus a reasonable dispensing fee, the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's charge to the party payors or the provider's charge to the party payors or the provider's charge to the party payors or the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's lowest	7		7	<del>-</del>
A. Not that I'm aware of.  Q. And why not?  A. I don't think it was possible to  implement.  Q. Why not?  A. Because I don't think the state had access to the lowest third-party plan costs.  Q. So it is but it is part of the proposed reimbursement policy, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And the state's reimbursement methodology was consistent with the state plan, or inconsistent?  A. It was consistent.  Q. Did it exercise this option of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan?  A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it.  Q. And why not?  A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you ande the markings at any time prior to today's deposition?  A. No.  A. No.  A. No.  A. No.  A. No.  A. Ves.  Jo And if you look at Section 12A prescribed drugs, will you read that out loud, please?  A. Yes. Drugs will be reimbursed at the set-set-below, plus a reasonable dispensing fee, the provider's lowest charge to other third-party plany?  A. Decause I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you  B. Khibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.	8	•	8	•
A. Not that I'm aware of.  Q. And why not?  A. I don't think it was possible to  implement.  Q. Why not?  A. Because I don't think the state had access to the lowest third-party plan costs.  Q. So it is but it is part of the proposed reimbursement policy, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And the state's reimbursement methodology was consistent with the state plan, or inconsistent?  A. It was consistent.  Q. Did it exercise this option of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan?  A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it.  Q. And why not?  A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you ande the markings at any time prior to today's deposition?  A. No.  A. No.  A. No.  A. No.  A. No.  A. Ves.  Jo And if you look at Section 12A prescribed drugs, will you read that out loud, please?  A. Yes. Drugs will be reimbursed at the set-set-below, plus a reasonable dispensing fee, the provider's lowest charge to other third-party plany?  A. Decause I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you  B. Khibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.	9	Q. Did the state implement that provision?	9	Q. Were they they were on the document
A. I don't think it was possible to implement.  Q. Why not?  A. Because I don't think the state had access to the lowest third-party plan costs.  Q. So it is but it is part of the proposed reimbursement policy, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And the state's reimbursement  proposed reimbursement policy, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And the state's reimbursement port methodology was consistent with the state plan, or inconsistent?  A. It was consistent.  Q. Did it exercise this option of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan?  A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it.  Q. And why not?  A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 12.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you  Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.  A. Yes.  Q. Had you made the markings at any time prior to today's deposition?  A. No.  Q. If you'll look at the first page, which is dated 10-1-1990, do you see that there on the bottom right-hand corner?  A. Nes.  Q. And if you look at Section 12A prescribed drugs, will you read that out loud, please?  A. Yes.  I lowest of the estimated acquisition cost, as described below, plus a reasonable dispensing fee, the provider's lowest charge to other third-party plans?  I lowest of the estimated acquisition cost, as described below, plus a reasonable dispensing fee, the provider's lowest charge to other third-party plans?  Q. And why not?  Q. And the next paragraph refers to multiple source drugs. Do you see that there?  A. Yes.	10	<del>_</del>	10	
A. I don't think it was possible to implement.  Q. Why not?  A. Because I don't think the state had access to the lowest third-party plan costs.  Q. So it is but it is part of the proposed reimbursement policy, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And the state's reimbursement policy acrineous stent?  A. It was consistent.  Q. Did it exercise this option of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan?  A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it.  Q. And why not?  A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this mext document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you and the markings at any time prior to today's deposition?  A. No.  Q. If you'll look at the first page, which is dated 10-1-1990, do you see that there on the bottom right-hand corner?  A. Ves.  Q. And if you look at Section 12A prescribed drugs, will you read that out loud, please?  A. Yes.  10 Q. And if you look at Section 12A prescribed drugs, will you read that out loud, please?  A. Yes.  11 lookest of the estimated acquisition cost, as lowest of the estimated ac	11	Q. And why not?	11	
implement.  Q. Why not?  A. Because I don't think the state had access to the lowest third-party plan costs.  Q. So it is but it is part of the proposed reimbursement policy, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And the state's reimbursement policy or inconsistent?  A. It was consistent.  Q. Did it exercise this option of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan?  A. I believe that it was stated that that think the state was able to enforce it.  Q. And why not?  A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this mext document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you  Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.	12	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	12	Q. Had you made the markings at any time
A. Because I don't think the state had access to the lowest third-party plan costs.  Q. So it is but it is part of the proposed reimbursement policy, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And the state's reimbursement methodology was consistent with the state plan, or inconsistent?  A. It was consistent.  Q. Did it exercise this option of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan?  A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it.  Q. And why not?  A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this nark document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.	13	<del>-</del>	13	
access to the lowest third-party plan costs.  Q. So it is but it is part of the proposed reimbursement policy, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And the state's reimbursement  methodology was consistent with the state plan, or inconsistent?  A. It was consistent.  Q. Did it exercise this option of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan?  A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it.  Q. And why not?  A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.	14	*	1.4	- · ·
access to the lowest third-party plan costs. Q. So it is but it is part of the proposed reimbursement policy, correct? A. Yes. Q. And the state's reimbursement methodology was consistent with the state plan, or inconsistent?  A. It was consistent. Q. Did it exercise this option of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan? A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it. Q. And why not? A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans. MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11. MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.) Q. It's two pages. I've handed you Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there? A. Yes. Q. It's a two-page document.	15	•	15	Q. If you'll look at the first page, which
Descriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plans.  A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  M. S. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  M. Yes.  17	16	access to the lowest third-party plan costs.	16	
18 proposed reimbursement policy, correct?  18 A. Yes.  Q. And the state's reimbursement methodology was consistent with the state plan, please? 22 or inconsistent?  83  A. It was consistent.  Q. Did it exercise this option of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan?  A. I believe that it was stated that that think the state was able to enforce it.  Q. And why not?  A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. And if you look at Section 12A prescribed drugs, will you read that out loud, please?  A. Yes. Drugs will be reimbursed at the lowest the cast in the out loud, please?  A. Yes. Drugs will be reimbursed at the lowest the cast of the estimated acquisition cost, as lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's charge to the general public. A dispensing fee will not be paid for prescriptions refilled in the same way, whether it is the same drug or generic equivalent drug.  Q. And the next paragraph refers to multiple source drugs. Do you see that there?  A. Yes.  Q. And it says: North Carolina has implemented a list of drugs and the prices, as published by the Health Care Finance  Administration.  Do you see that?  A. Yes.  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you  Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It's two-page document.	17		1.7	· ·
A. Yes.  Q. And the state's reimbursement methodology was consistent with the state plan, or inconsistent?  A. It was consistent.  Q. Did it exercise this option of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan?  A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it.  Q. And why not?  A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It's two-page document.	1.8		18	<del>-</del>
Q. And the state's reimbursement methodology was consistent with the state plan, or inconsistent?  A. It was consistent.  Q. Did it exercise this option of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan?  A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it.  Q. And why not?  A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you  Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.	19	·	19	
21 methodology was consistent with the state plan, or inconsistent?  22	20	Q. And the state's reimbursement	20	
22 A. Yes. Drugs will be reimbursed at the  83  A. It was consistent.  Q. Did it exercise this option of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan? A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it. Q. And why not? A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  R. Yes. Q. It's two pages. I've handed you Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there? Q. It's a two-page document.  A. Yes. Q. It's two-page document.  A. Yes.  22 A. Yes. Drugs will be reimbursed at the  85  A. Yes. Drugs will be reimbursed at the  85  A. Yes. Drugs will be reimbursed at the  85  A. Yes. described below, plus a reasonable dispensing 6 fee, the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's charge to other third-party payors or the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the p	21		1	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
A. It was consistent.  Q. Did it exercise this option of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan? A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it. Q. And why not? A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes. Q. It's a two-page document.  1 lowest of the estimated acquisition cost, as described below, plus a reasonable dispensing fee, the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's charge to the party payors or the provider's charge to other third-party payors or the provider's charge to the general public. A dispensing fee will not be party payors or the provider's charge to other third-party payors or the provider's charge to the general public. A dispensing fee, the provider's charge to other third-party payors or the provider's charge to the general public. A dispensing fee, the provider's charge to other third-party payors or the provider's charge to the general public. A dispensing fee, the provider's charge to other third-party payors or the provider's charge to the general public. A dispensing fee, the provider's charge to other third-party payors or the provider's charge to the general public. A dispensing fee, the provider's charge to the general public. A dispensing fee, the provider's charge to the general public. A dispensing fee, the provider's charge to the general public. A dispensing fee, the provider's charge to the general public. A dispensing fee, the provider's charge to the general public. A dispensing fee, the provider's charge to the general public. A dispensing fee, the p	22		1	•
Q. Did it exercise this option of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan? A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it. Q. And why not? Q. And why not? A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes. Q. It's a two-page document.  2 described below, plus a reasonable dispensing fee, the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's charge to the general public. A dispensing fee will not be paid for prescriptions refilled in the same way, whether it is the same drug or generic equivalent drug.  Q. And the next paragraph refers to multiple source drugs. Do you see that there?  A. Yes.  Q. And it says: North Carolina has implemented a list of drugs and the prices, as published by the Health Care Finance Administration.  Do you see that?  A. Yes.  Q. Is that the same list published by the Health Care Finance Administration that we referred to in the prior state plan?  A. Yes.		83	Ť	
Q. Did it exercise this option of not allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan? A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it. Q. And why not? Q. And why not? A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes. Q. It's a two-page document.  2 described below, plus a reasonable dispensing fee, the provider's lowest charge to other third-party payors or the provider's charge to the general public. A dispensing fee will not be paid for prescriptions refilled in the same way, whether it is the same drug or generic equivalent drug.  Q. And the next paragraph refers to multiple source drugs. Do you see that there?  A. Yes.  Q. And it says: North Carolina has implemented a list of drugs and the prices, as published by the Health Care Finance Administration.  Do you see that?  A. Yes.  Q. Is that the same list published by the Health Care Finance Administration that we referred to in the prior state plan?  A. Yes.	1	A. It was consistent.	1	lowest of the estimated acquisition cost, as
allowing providers to bill more for Medicaid prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan?  A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it.  Q. And why not?  A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.  A. Yes.	2		1	<del>-</del>
prescriptions than are receiving, than they are receiving from the lowest third-party plan?  A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it.  Q. And why not?  A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Rayes.  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you  Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.  4 party payors or the provider's charge to the general public. A dispensing fee will not be paid for prescriptions refilled in the same way, whether it is the same drug or generic equivalent drug.  9 Q. And the next paragraph refers to multiple source drugs. Do you see that there?  A. Yes.  Q. And it says: North Carolina has implemented a list of drugs and the prices, as published by the Health Care Finance  Administration.  Do you see that?  A. Yes.  Q. Is that the same list published by the Health Care Finance Administration that we referred to in the prior state plan?  A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.	3	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	3	
receiving from the lowest third-party plan?  A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it. Q. And why not?  A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes. Q. It's a two-page document.  Segeneral public. A dispensing fee will not be paid for prescriptions refilled in the same way, whether it is the same drug or generic equivalent drug.  Q. And the next paragraph refers to multiple source drugs. Do you see that there?  A. Yes. Q. And it says: North Carolina has implemented a list of drugs and the prices, as published by the Health Care Finance Administration.  Do you see that?  A. Yes. Q. Is that the same list published by the Health Care Finance Administration that we referred to in the prior state plan?  A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.	4	· -	4	
A. I believe that it was stated that that would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it. Q. And why not?  A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.  A. I believe that it was stated that that bail for prescriptions refilled in the same way, whether it is the same drug or generic equivalent drug.  A. Yes.  Q. And the next paragraph refers to multiple source drugs. Do you see that there?  A. Yes.  Q. And it says: North Carolina has implemented a list of drugs and the prices, as published by the Health Care Finance Administration.  Do you see that?  A. Yes.  Q. Is that the same list published by the Health Care Finance Administration that we referred to in the prior state plan?  A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.	5		5	- · · · · · ·
would be good if that were possible, but I don't think the state was able to enforce it.  Q. And why not?  A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.  Whether it is the same drug or generic equivalent drug.  R. Whether it is the same drug or generic equivalent drug.  R. Whether it is the same drug or generic equivalent drug.  R. Whether it is the same drug or generic equivalent drug.  R. Whether it is the same drug or generic equivalent drug.  R. Whether it is the same drug or generic equivalent drug.  R. Whether it is the same drug or generic equivalent drug.  R. Whether it is the same drug or generic equivalent drug.  R. Whether it is the same drug or generic equivalent drug.  R. Whether it is the same drug or generic equivalent drug.  R. Wes.	6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	6	
think the state was able to enforce it.  Q. And why not?  A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you  Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. And the next paragraph refers to multiple source drugs. Do you see that there?  A. Yes.  Q. And it says: North Carolina has implemented a list of drugs and the prices, as published by the Health Care Finance  Administration.  Do you see that?  A. Yes.  Q. Is that the same list published by the Health Care Finance Administration that we referred to in the prior state plan?  A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.	7		7	
Q. And why not?  A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third- party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. And the next paragraph refers to multiple source drugs. Do you see that there?  A. Yes.  Q. And it says: North Carolina has implemented a list of drugs and the prices, as published by the Health Care Finance Administration.  Do you see that?  A. Yes.  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. Is that the same list published by the Health Care Finance Administration that we referred to in the prior state plan?  A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.	8		8	
A. Because I don't believe the state had access to the costs associated with other third- party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  unultiple source drugs. Do you see that there?  A. Yes.  Q. And it says: North Carolina has implemented a list of drugs and the prices, as published by the Health Care Finance Administration.  Do you see that?  A. Yes.  Q. Is that the same list published by the Health Care Finance Administration that we referred to in the prior state plan?  A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.	9		9	_
access to the costs associated with other third-party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  A. Yes.  A. Yes.  Q. And it says: North Carolina has implemented a list of drugs and the prices, as published by the Health Care Finance Administration.  Do you see that?  A. Yes.  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you  Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.  A. Yes.  A. Yes.  A. Yes.	10	•	10	
party plans.  MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. And it says: North Carolina has implemented a list of drugs and the prices, as published by the Health Care Finance Administration.  Do you see that?  A. Yes.  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there? A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.  12 Q. And it says: North Carolina has implemented a list of drugs and the prices, as published by the Health Care Finance Administration.  Do you see that?  A. Yes.  Q. Is that the same list published by the Health Care Finance Administration that we referred to in the prior state plan?  A. Yes.	1,1		11	
13 MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this 14 next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11. 15 (The document referred to was 16 marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for 17 identification.) 18 Q. It's two pages. I've handed you 19 Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. It's a two-page document. 21 implemented a list of drugs and the prices, as 23 published by the Health Care Finance 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. Is that the same list published by the 26 Health Care Finance Administration that we 27 referred to in the prior state plan? 28 A. Yes. 29 A. Yes. 20 A. Yes.	12		1	Q. And it says: North Carolina has
next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.  (The document referred to was referred to wa	13	MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this	13	·
marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. Is that the same list published by the Health Care Finance Administration that we referred to in the prior state plan?  Q. It's a two-page document.  A. Yes.	14	next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.	14	
identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you  Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. Is that the same list published by the  Health Care Finance Administration that we  A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.  A. Yes.  A. Yes.	15	(The document referred to was	15	· ·
identification.)  Q. It's two pages. I've handed you  Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. Is that the same list published by the  Health Care Finance Administration that we referred to in the prior state plan?  Q. It's a two-page document.  A. Yes.	16	marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 011 for	16	Do you see that?
Exhibit 11, Ms. Weeks. Do you have that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It's a two-page document.  19 Health Care Finance Administration that we referred to in the prior state plan?  21 A. Yes.	17	identification.)	17	·
20 A. Yes. 20 referred to in the prior state plan? 21 Q. It's a two-page document. 21 A. Yes.	18	Q. It's two pages. I've handed you	18	Q. Is that the same list published by the
20 A. Yes. 20 referred to in the prior state plan? 21 Q. It's a two-page document. 21 A. Yes.	19		19	• • •
Q. It's a two-page document.	20		20	referred to in the prior state plan?
Do you recognize this document? 22 Q. And as we refer to as the federal upper	21	Q. It's a two-page document.	21	
	22	Do you recognize this document?	22	Q. And as we refer to as the federal upper

Henderson Legal Services, Inc.

October 21, 2008

(Pages 86 to 89) 23

				<b>=</b> 1
	. 86		88	
1	limit prior, earlier today?	1	when a public source was not available?	<b>l</b> i
2	A. Yes.	2	A. I believe on occasion but very rarely.	
3	Q. The paragraph that you just read refers	3	Q. And by very rarely, how often per year	
4	to the estimated acquisition cost as described	4	do you mean?	
5	below.	5	A. Would only be for manual claims that we	
6	Do you see that there?	6	didn't have the AWP available. And I don't have	
7	A. Yes.	7	an exact number, but it's very rare.	0.00
8	Q. Does the state plan define the	8	Q. Very rare that you contacted them, or	00.000
9	estimated acquisition cost below, as that	9	very rare that you did not have the AWP	
.0	paragraph says that it does?	10	available?	100000
.1	A. No, not in that next section.	11	A. Both.	
.2	Q. Does it describe the estimated	12	Q. And if you look at the prior paragraph,	Specialism
.3	acquisition cost as part of the plan?	13	No. 1, other drugs, would you take a minute to	- Typering
.4	A. It does as part of the plan.	14	look that over, please?	
.5	Q. And where does it describe it? What	15	A. Yes.	
.6	paragraph?	16	(Pause.)	
.0 .7	A. In another paragraph under North	17	A. Okay.	
. 8	Carolina estimated acquisition cost.	18	Q. Does this reflect the reimbursement	
.9	Q. And could you read that out loud,	19	logic that you set forth at the earlier part of	
20	please?	20	the deposition as far as the formula?	
1	A. Yes. NCEAC	21	A. It's similar.	
22	Q. What does that stand for, I'm sorry?	22	Q. And why don't you explain that to me?	
- 4		-		
	87		89	1000
1	A. North Carolina Estimated Acquisition	1	A. Over time it's changed somewhat, but	
2	Cost.	2	it's similar in that North Carolina uses the	
3	Q. Thank you.	3	lesser of logic. We will pay the estimated	
4	A. Is defined as the reasonable and best	4	acquisition cost or the providers or the	J.
5	estimate of the price paid by providers for a	5	provider's usual and customary. We no longer	FN Re:
6	drug, as obtained from a manufacturer or other	6	have the lowest charge to other third-party	III FN
7	legal distributor. As determined by the	7	payors in our state plan.	100%
8	division, the reasonable and best estimate is	8		
9	based on the average wholesale price, (AWP) less	9	state plan that we are reviewing right now?	Uha Uha
.0	ten percent. For the AWP information, the	10	A. 10-1-89.	Oh
. 1	division uses the Red Book manufacturer's price	11	MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this	113
.2	list or other nationally published sources.	12	next document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 12.	(pf
.3	Telephone contact with manufacturer or	13	(The document referred to was	III ( Pf
.4	distributors may be utilized when a published	14	marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 012 for	
.5	source is not available.	15	identification.)	0.00
.6	Q. Thank you. Is that the estimated	16	Q. Ms. Weeks, do you recognize this	100
7	acquisition cost as described below that was	17	document?	(depends)
8.	referred to on the prior page?	18	A. Yes.	
.9	A. Yes.	19	Q. And what is it?	Property of the second
0	Q. And the last line of that paragraph	20	A. It's another North Carolina State plan.	
21		21	Q. And what is this one dated?	
22	Carolina contact manufacturers or distributors	22	A. July 1, 1992.	200

October 21, 2008

#### Raleigh, NC

#### 24 (Pages 90 to 93)

l <del></del>			
	90		92
1	Q. I'd like you to and what section of	1	manufacturer's price list or other nationally
2	the state plan is it?	2	published sources, telephone contact with
3	A. It is regarding reimbursement of drugs.	3	manufacturer distributors may be utilized when a
4	Q. And if you look at that first section,	4	published source is not available.
5	No. 1, other drugs, and you look at that	5	Q. Did North Carolina in fact obtain AWP
6	reimbursement formula there?	6	information from the First Data Bank price update
7	A. Yes.	7	service, manufacturer's list price or other
8	Q. I think you were just discussing that	8	nationally published sources?
9	the lowest third-party plan portion of the	9	A. Yes.
10	reimbursement formula was omitted at a certain	10	Q. And this document is dated 1992,
ii .		11	correct?
11	time, is that correct?	1	
12	A. Yes,	12	A. Yes.
13	Q. And this 1992 plan does not include	13	Q. From 1992 to the present, did North
14	that language, correct?	14	Carolina obtain its AWP information from the
15	A. That's correct.	15	First Data Bank price update service,
16	Q. Okay. Does this plan reflect the 1992	16	manufacturer's price list or other nationally
17	North Carolina reimbursement formula for drugs?	17	published sources?
1.8	A. Yes.	18	A. Yes.
19	Q. And what was the formula as set forth	19	MS. YAVELBERG: I'd like to mark this
20	in the state plan?	20	next document as Exhibit 13.
21	A. Okay. The North Carolina estimated	21	(The document referred to was
22	acquisition cost, okay, I'm sorry, I don't	22	marked Plaintiff's Exhibit Weeks 013 for
	91		93
1	understand the question.	1	identification.)
2	Q. What was the reimbursement formula, as	2	MS. YAVELBERG: It's three pages.
3	set forth in the state plan in 1992?	3	Q. Ms. Weeks, if you can take a minute to
4	A. Okay. The state reimbursed based on	4	look the document over.
5	AWP minus ten percent or the provider's usual and	5	(Pause.)
6	customary charge to the general public at the	6	Q. And do you recognize this document?
7	lower of either of those.	7	A. Yes.
8	Q. And did North Carolina define estimated	8	Q. What is it?
9	acquisition cost in the state plan?	9	A. It is, again North Carolina state plan
10	A. Yes.	10	section for drug reimbursement.
11	Q. And where did it do so?	11	Q. And the first page of the document that
12	A. It does so in this section two, North	12	I've handed you.
13	Carolina estimated acquisition cost. It defines	13	A. Yes.
14	it as AWP less ten percent.	14	Q. What is this document? What is this
15	Q. And does the state plan say where North	15	page?
16	Carolina obtained information about average	1.6	A. It looks like the page where the state
17	wholesale price?	17	plan was transmitted to CMS.
18	A. Yes.	18	Q. Is it a specific form?
19	Q. And where is that from? Where does it	19	A. Yes.
20	say it obtained the information?	20	Q. And what is the form?
21	A. It says it obtained it from using the	21	A. It says transmittal and notice of
22	First Data Bank price update service,	22	approval of state plan material.
<u> </u>	A 11 DA 2-10 CH ADMINIS PLEASE SEPARATE DEL TITO)	<u> </u>	approvaror state plan material.